UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/618,865	07/14/2003	Dharma Shukla	5486-0147PUS1	6961
	7590 04/21/200 ART, KOLASCH & B	EXAMINER		
8110 GATEHOUSE ROAD SUITE 100 EAST FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747			WOOD, WILLIAM H	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			04/21/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/618,865	SHUKLA ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

	William H. Wood	2193	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>17 March 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	ALLOWANCE.	
The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apperior Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	the same day as filing a Notice of Areplies: (1) an amendment, affidavioal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	g date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further cor (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	nsideration and/or search (see NOT w);	TE below);	
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a control of the present additional claims without canceling a control of the present additional claims without canceling a control of the present additional claims without cancel at 23(a).			ne issues for
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):		mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).		imely filed amendmer	t canceling the
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-8 and 29-39. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation	n of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
	/William H. Wood/ Primary Examiner, Art U	nit 2193	

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with regard to the prior art rejections are not persuasive. Applicant argues Jabri fails to disclose a visual display surface and the attendent user selected supported inserted graphcial shape-constructs corresponding to the visual images on the visual display surface. Clearly, Jabri discloses visual modeling and thus graphical shape-constructs (paragraphs 0025 and 0026) and this further is carried out by a visual display surface (the visual modeling tool's display). Hollingsworth is cited for and discloses semantics/compatibility of graphical elements (column 1, lines 52-62, "depend on semantic interpretation to be applied to the graphical object"; column 2, lines 56-61 and column 3, lines 30-34). Semantic verfication is a form of compatibility determination. Therefore, the prior art rejections are maintained. Claims objections of the previous office action's paragraph 2 are overcome. Claim rejections with regard to section 101 are overcome. Claim rejections under 112 second paragraph are overcome. Claim rejections under 112 first paragraph are maintained as Applicant's arguments are not immediately persuasive. Applicant has not demonstrated the language or general meaning of the language ("without developer involvement" in the context of the claim) to be supported by the originally filed specification. Similarly, the argument with respect to claims 37-39 is not persuasive with regard to rejections under section 112.